

H.R. 5041

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT OF BOUNDARIES OF SEGMENT OF UPPER MISSOURI WILD AND SCENIC RIVER, MONTANA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of the Wild and Scenic River Act (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.)—

(1) the boundaries and classification of the Missouri River, Montana, segment designated by section 3(a)(14) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)(14)) shall be the boundaries and classification published in the Federal Register on January 22, 1980 (45 Fed. Reg. 4474–4478); and

(2) the management plan for such segment shall be as set forth in—

(A) the Upper Missouri Wild and Scenic River Management Plan, dated October 1978, as updated in February 1993; and

(B) the West HiLine RMP/EIS Record of Decision covering the Upper Missouri Wild and Scenic River Corridor, dated January 1992.

(b) REVISION OF BOUNDARIES, CLASSIFICATION, AND MANAGEMENT PLAN.—This section shall not be considered to limit the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to revise the boundaries, classification, or management plan for the Missouri River, Montana, segment referred to in subsection (a) after the date of the enactment of this Act and in accordance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall be considered to have become effective on April 21, 1980.

□ 1400

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 5041, introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL), establishes the boundaries and classification of a segment of the Missouri River in Montana under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. The boundary and classification of this segment will conform to those published and recommended by the Department of the Interior in 1980. The Bureau of Land Management has been managing the river as wild and scenic since 1980.

In essence, Madam Speaker, this is a technical correction to the law enacted in 1980. Apparently, this wild and scenic designation lacked the proper documentation and this bill clears up discrepancy.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5041.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 5041 would establish the boundaries and classification for a segment of the Missouri River in Montana that was designated

under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act in 1976. This is legislation introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL).

Madam Speaker, this legislation was introduced in late July, and while the bill was never considered by the Committee on Resources, we at least have the views of the administration on this matter. In a letter dated October 3 of this year, the Department of the Interior indicated their support for H.R. 5041.

Evidently, in the late 1970s, several procedural steps were not followed in establishing the river's boundaries and providing for its classification. By adopting the river's boundaries and classification by statute, H.R. 5041 would remove any doubt that may exist on this matter.

Madam Speaker, we have no objection to this legislation, which we view as a technical housekeeping matter. We urge its passage.

Mr. HILL of Montana. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5041, a bill to establish the boundaries and classification of a segment of the Missouri River in Montana under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. This bill is a technical correction to the 1976 amendment to the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act for the Upper Missouri National Wild and Scenic River. This legislation would ensure that the 149-mile segment, approximately 90,000 acres in size, of the Upper Missouri National Wild and Scenic River remains protected for future generations. This bill has the Administration's support.

On October 12, 1976, Congress amended the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to include the Upper Missouri National Wild and Scenic River. The amendment required the Department of Interior to establish boundaries and prepare a development plan within one year. This information was to be published in the Federal Register, but would not become effective until 90 days after the documents were forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. When the boundaries of the Wild and Scenic River were challenged some years later, it could not be established whether or not Congress ever received the documents that the Department of Interior prepared on this segment of the Upper Missouri River. It was also discovered that the documents were never published in the Federal Register.

On January 22, 1980, the Department of Interior promulgated regulations at 45 Fed. Reg. 4474–4478 that summarized a revised management plan and identified the boundaries and classification for the 149-mile segment of the Upper Missouri National Wild and Scenic River from Fort Benton, Montana, downstream to the Fred Robinson Bridge. H.R. 5041 would adopt these boundaries and classification by statute, removing any doubt over the legitimacy of the boundaries that remains as a result of earlier events.

A similar bill to this one, H.R. 6046 passed the House of Representatives on September 29, 1992, but failed to pass the Senate in the closing days of the 101st Congress.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5041.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING FUNDS TO REHABILITATE GOING-TO-THE-SUN ROAD IN GLACIER PARK

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4521) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to authorize and provide funding for rehabilitation of the Going-to-the-Sun Road in Glacier National Park, to authorize funds for maintenance of utilities related to the Park, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4521

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The historic significance of the 52-mile Going-to-the-Sun Road is recognized by its listing on the National Register of Historic Places in 1983, designation as a National Historic Engineering Landmark by the American Society of Civil Engineers in 1985, and designation as a National Historic Landmark in 1997.

(2) A contracted engineering study and Federal Highway Administration recommendations in 1997 of the Going-to-the-Sun Road verified significant structural damage to the road that has occurred since it opened in 1932.

(3) Infrastructure at most of the developed areas is inadequate for cold-season (fall, winter, and spring) operation, and maintenance backlog needs exist for normal summer operation.

(4) The Many Glacier Hotel and Lake McDonald Lodge are on the National Register of Historic Places and are National Historic Landmarks. Other accommodations operated by the concessioner with possessory interest and listed on the National Register of Historic Places are the Rising Sun Motor Inn and Swiftcurrent Motel.

(5) The historic hotels in Glacier National Park, operated under concession agreements with the National Park Service, are essential for public use and enjoyment of the Park.

(6) Public consumers deserve safe hotels in Glacier National Park that can meet their basic needs and expectations.

(7) The historic hotels in Glacier National Park are significantly deteriorated and need substantial repair.

(8) Repairs of the hotels in Glacier National Park have been deferred for so long that, absent any changes to Federal law and the availability of historic tax credits, the remodeling costs for the hotels may exceed the capacity of an investor to finance them solely out of hotel revenues.

(9) The current season of operation for hotels is approximately 4 months because the developed areas lack water, sewer, and fire protection systems that can operate in freezing conditions, lack building insulation, and lack heating systems.

(10) The National Park Service Concessions Management Improvement Act of 1998 is based upon sound principles and is achieving its basic purposes, but there appear to be selected instances where the National Park Service may need additional authority to conduct demonstration projects.

(11) A demonstration project is needed for the repair of the historic hotels in Glacier National Park.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—The term “Advisory Committee” means the Going-to-the-Sun Road Citizens Advisory Committee.

(2) **PARK.**—The term “Park” means Glacier National Park.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. GOING-TO-THE-SUN ROAD STUDY.

(a) **FEASIBILITY STUDY.**—Not later than December 31, 2001, the Secretary, in consultation with Advisory Committee, shall complete a feasibility study for rehabilitation of Going-to-the-Sun Road located in the Park. The study shall include—

(1) alternatives for rehabilitation of Going-to-the-Sun Road and a ranking of the feasibility of each alternative;

(2) an estimate of the length of time necessary to complete each alternative;

(3) a description of what mitigation efforts would be used to preserve resources and minimize adverse economic effects of each alternative;

(4) an analysis of the costs and benefits of each alternative;

(5) an estimate of the cost of each alternative;

(6) an analysis of the economic impact of each alternative;

(7) an analysis of long-term maintenance needs, standards, and schedules for the road, alternatives to accomplish the rehabilitation, maintenance staff needs, and associated cost estimates;

(8) a draft of the environmental impact statement required under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)); and

(9) an analysis of improvements to any transportation system relating to the Park that are needed inside or outside the Park.

(b) **CONTINUATION MAINTENANCE.**—Nothing in this section shall affect the duty of the Secretary to continue the program in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act to preserve, maintain, and address safety concerns related to Going-to-the-Sun Road.

(c) **IMPLEMENTATION OF PLAN.**—As soon as practicable after completing the study required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) consider the recommendations of the Advisory Committee;

(2) choose an alternative for rehabilitation of the Going-to-the-Sun Road from the alternatives included in the study based upon the final environmental impact statement required under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)); and

(3) begin implementation of a plan based on that choice.

Implementation actions that are authorized include rehabilitation of Going-to-the-Sun Road and expenditure of funds inside or outside the Park for transportation system improvements related to the Park and impact mitigation if recommended by the study and the Advisory Committee. The Secretary shall also seek funding for

the long-term maintenance needs that the study identifies.

(d) **REPORT.**—Not later than 30 days after completion of the study required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit a copy of the study to—

(1) the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated \$200,000,000 to the Secretary to carry out this section, including—

(1) implementation of the plan under subsection (c); and

(2) the cost of any necessary environmental or cultural documentation and monitoring, including the draft environmental impact statement required under subsection (a)(8).

SEC. 4. MAINTENANCE AND UPGRADE OF UTILITY SYSTEMS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after funds are made available under this section, the Secretary shall begin the upgrade and continue the maintenance of utility systems which service the Park and facilities related to the Park.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section, \$20,000,000.

SEC. 5. VISITOR FACILITIES PLAN.

(a) **PLAN FOR VISITOR FACILITIES.**—Not later than December 31, 2001, the Secretary shall complete a comprehensive plan for visitor facilities in the Park. The comprehensive plan shall include the following:

(1) A completed commercial services plan, as called for in the Park General Management Plan.

(2) A plan for private financing of rehabilitation of lodging facilities and associated property that are listed on the National Register of Historic Places or are part of a district listed on the National Register of Historic Places, which may include historic tax credits, hotel revenue, and other financing alternatives as deemed appropriate by the Secretary, and which may include options such as extending the Park's visitor season, additional visitor facilities, and other options as deemed appropriate by the Secretary in order to recover the rehabilitation costs.

(3) A financial analysis of the plan under paragraph (2).

(4) A plan by the Secretary to provide necessary assistance to appropriate interested entities for the restoration or comparable replacement of tour buses for use in the Park.

(5) A plan for a new visitors center at the west side of the Park, including an appropriate location and design for the center and suitable housing and display facilities for museum objects of the Park as set forth in the Park General Management Plan, including any studies required to be carried out under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and other applicable laws.

(6) A parkwide natural and cultural resources assessment, in accordance with sections 203 and 204 of the National Parks Omnibus Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-391; 112 Stat. 3497), including a comprehensive inventory of resources of the Park.

(7) A description of any additional authority requested by the Secretary to implement the comprehensive plan.

(b) **SUBMISSION OF PLAN.**—The Secretary shall submit copies of the comprehensive plan to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(c) **IMPLEMENTATION OF PLAN.**—As soon as practicable after completion of the comprehen-

sive plan, the Secretary shall implement the comprehensive plan, including construct the visitors center pursuant to the plan required by subsection (a)(5).

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary \$1,000,000 to complete the comprehensive plan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 4521, as introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL), will ensure the future protection of Glacier National Park by laying out a plan to restore the Going-to-the-Sun Road, upgrading utility systems in the park, and the future of the grand lodges in the park. The gentleman from Montana has worked diligently on this legislation and should be commended for his service to Montana and the Congress.

Madam Speaker, this is good legislation that will ensure that future steps taken by Glacier National Park will enhance the ability of the public to access and to enjoy one of America's great parks. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4521, as amended.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, H.R. 4521, introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL), would direct the Secretary of the Interior to develop and implement a plan, at a cost of up to \$200 million, for the rehabilitation of the Going-to-the-Sun Road in Glacier National Park. The bill also authorizes \$20 million for maintenance of utility systems.

The third significant provision of this bill deals with the rehabilitation of the Many Glacier Hotel and other structures in the park. When the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands held a hearing on the bill, the administration and others raised a number of concerns with the bill's language. Following the hearing, meetings were held with the staff of our colleague from Montana and the congressional delegation from Montana, the National Park Service, and the committee staff.

While major progress was made in addressing the issues with the bill, significant issues remained. Instead of seeking closure on these remaining issues, the Committee on Resources adopted a new amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) that discarded the progress that had been made in addressing the park hotel rehabilitation and instead proposed new language that had not been

discussed yet, let alone agreed to by the parties.

As a result, the bill reported by the committee has substantive and procedural problems. It fails to address the concerns raised by the administration and the historic preservation and environmental community, and it does not reflect the unified position within the Montana congressional delegation. The bill reported from the committee fails to authorize the one authority, historic leasing, that the National Park Service says they need for park hotel rehabilitation. It creates a new responsibility for the National Park Service to provide park road reconstruction impact mitigation assistance.

In addition, the amended bill directs preparation of a new visitor facilities plant. Further, the time frame, December 31 of 2001, for completion of the visitor's facility plan, and also the required concession services plan and natural resource assessment, is too short to do the necessary work and environmental analyses.

Finally, the bill's findings represent a particular point of view and are inconsistent with the authorities contained in the bill.

Madam Speaker, the minority is willing to work with the interested parties to address the concerns with this legislation. Unfortunately, what is being presented to the House today fails to correct the bill's shortcomings.

Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume only to comment that the condition of the lodge, which I think we all agree at the park is in horrendous condition, and while we have minor differences on how to go about this, the problem is that we may lose that facility forever if we do not work to pass this legislation immediately.

Madam Speaker, I move to pass this good piece of legislation by our colleague, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL), who is retiring from the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. HILL of Montana. Madam Speaker, H.R. 4521 attempts to deal with the serious infrastructure issues that exist in Glacier National Park in northwest Montana, one of the truly heavenly places on earth.

The Going-to-the-Sun Road, which runs through the park and is consistently rated among the top scenic routes in the nation, has degraded severely since it opened in 1932. The utility infrastructure, particularly the sewer system, is badly in need of repair. Recently about 180,000 gallons of raw sewage leaked onto the south shore of Lake McDonald, and the state of Montana is threatening to take action against the park. And the historic hotels of Glacier Park, many of which are listed on the National Register of Historic Places, are quickly becoming safety issues that threaten the visitor experience. Recently the Park imposed

corrective measures at Many Glacier Hotel to address fire code violations that are a result of deferred maintenance. The rehabilitation costs at Many Glacier alone are estimated at more than \$30 million, with overall costs at around \$100 million.

This bill addresses these issues by authorizing funds to repair the park's infrastructure, with the exception of the hotels, and setting a timetable for a specific plan to privately finance the rehabilitation of the park's historic hotels, in which there is currently significant possessory interest. It authorizes funds for the repair of the Going-to-the-Sun Road. The bill also requires that the Secretary work with a Citizen Advisory Committee that has been gathering local input and determining the best possible option for the repairs. The bill also authorizes funds to repair the park's failing utility systems.

These repairs are already authorized under the Park Service's General Authorities Act. However, the situation in Glacier is critical and is near the top of the Park Service's priority list. This bill will put Congress on record regarding the importance of Glacier National Park, as well as move the Park Service in the direction it has said it intends to go.

Some have discussed the issue of cost relating to the Going-to-the-Sun Road. For those who have been privileged to drive this scenic route, it is like no other, at times clinging to a mountainside and ascending the Continental Divide. It is the only route through the park and provides millions of Americans with views of diverse wildlife and great natural beauty. But it is at risk of catastrophic failure, and it will be costly to replace. Repair costs are compounded by a short construction season in this extreme climate, the topography and access issues, as well as the historic stone retaining walls that are built from local materials. Costs will also be partly determined by the construction alternative selected, and the need for appropriations could be significantly mitigated.

A source of greater controversy, however, was how best to finance the rehabilitation of the historic hotels. Originally, the hotel-financing provision was written with significant input from the Park Service and was intended to provide the Secretary with the greatest degree of latitude in achieving private financing for the project. Key to this goal was providing a way to capture historic restoration tax credits of 20 percent which require investment over a 50-year period, realizing that our current concessions law limits contracts to no more than 20 years.

This Park Service's provision came under fire from environmental organizations. Unfortunately, rather than defend the provision, the Park Service quickly back-pedaled and opposed it. This left us in a precarious position. The Park Service then proposed an alternate version that would use historic leasing authority to rehabilitate the hotels. But members of the minority as well as the administration were never able to get on the same page. And we in the majority and others have had concerns with the various proposals that began emerging.

It was disappointing when the support that had been building behind the bill evaporated after interest groups who oppose the idea of

private investment in national parks weighed in. The result was proposals that were, at best, financially questionable and, at worst, extinguished the notion of possessory interest in these historic structures altogether. This is a dangerous path to go down, and which represents a serious step backward in the body of law that has been crafted by Congress regarding national parks.

I am disappointed that Democrats and the administration were never able to agree among themselves. I was willing to accommodate these various proposals even though I and others in the business and financial communities had serious questions about them, provided that they be willing to consider other alternatives such as the original financing mechanism. But there was never an inch of latitude given.

The new version of this bill was intended to pull us back from the notion of moving toward a single financing mechanism that ultimately may not work. While the Park Service should be lauded for its creativity in crafting a plan based on historic leasing, there were too many unanswered questions about that proposal that I fear may go unanswered. Specifically, I cannot understand what objections the Park Service would have, if we are going to settle on a single option, to ensuring its option will work financially before we move forward with it. After we have that data, the bill would direct the Secretary to request any additional authority he may require from Congress to complete the plan.

My staff and I numerous times attempted to discuss the committee-approved version of the bill with the minority. Then one legislative day before the full House was originally to consider this bill, a list of new concerns emerged from the minority. One that is particularly intriguing is the contention that the deadline for the visitor facilities plan and other provisions of the bill—December 31, 2000—is too ambitious. It is intriguing because the minority initially argued that the deadline in the bill was a delaying tactic. Which is it, a delaying tactic, or too ambitious? This all leads one to suspect that the goal of some has not been to improve upon this legislation, but rather, to defeat it for the sake of defeat.

This is unacceptable. We must approve this bill and give the Senate a chance to do likewise before we adjourn. Anything less would be dereliction of our duty to protect our public lands, in this case, Glacier National Park.

I'd like to briefly address some of the other criticisms I have heard recently. First, that the bill authorizes economic mitigation for the Going-to-the-Sun reconstruction. I have been willing to compromise on this issue. However, there is significant precedent within the Park Service to mitigate the impacts of its actions on communities around it, most notably the recent redwoods acquisition in California and the compensation of fishermen at Glacier Bay in Alaska. That being said, H.R. 4521 is not prescriptive. It merely authorizes mitigation assistance, it does not mandate it, and it does so within the overall bounds of the authorization of the road itself.

Second, that there were not sufficient efforts to reach agreement in the Montana congressional delegation. My staff and I worked long and hard to find a solution that was pleasing

both to the Montana delegation and to the majority and minority in the House. But it became apparent, at least as far as the hotels were concerned, that this would not be possible. No agreement ever existed, even though staff was circulating legislative language for the approval of members. It is unfortunate for those of us in Montana that some would kill this bill over the hotels provision and jeopardize the road and public access to the park.

Despite the difficulties and frustrations in getting to this point, we have worked hard to make this a bipartisan effort, securing 33 cosponsors from a variety of fiscal and ideological viewpoints. The people of Montana and all those who love Glacier National Park are grateful for these efforts. By some estimates, this park alone generates close to \$200 million for Montana's economy, which needs tourism dollars now more than ever as forces continue to act to close down Montana's traditional industries. But for many of us, this park is about a whole lot more than money, it is about a unique character and a once-in-a-lifetime experience for those who visit. This legislation is needed to help restore those values.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4521, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATING CERTAIN LANDS IN VIRGINIA AS WILDERNESS AREAS

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4646) to designate certain National Forest System lands within the boundaries of the State of Virginia as wilderness areas, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4646

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF WILDERNESS AREAS.

Section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to designate certain National Forest System lands in the States of Virginia and West Virginia as wilderness areas", approved June 7, 1988 (102 Stat. 584) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(7) certain lands in the George Washington National Forest, which comprise approximately 5,963 acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled 'The Priest Wilderness Study Area', dated June 6, 2000, and which shall be known as the Priest Wilderness Area; and

"(8) certain lands in the George Washington National Forest, which comprise approximately 4,608 acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled 'The Three Ridges Wilderness Study Area', dated June 6, 2000, and which shall be known as the Three Ridges Wilderness Area.'".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 4646 was introduced by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) to designate two areas in the George Washington National Forest in Virginia as wilderness. Both areas were recommended for wilderness studies in the George Washington National Forest plan completed in 1993.

I understand these are steep rugged areas, and that there is some concern that the Forest Service will continue to allow the use of motorized equipment, such as chainsaws or access by vehicles if it is necessary to fight fire or otherwise respond to emergencies. To address this concern, my colleague wisely included language stating the wilderness designation would not prevent firefighting companies or rescue squads from doing what is needed in emergency situations.

While I would prefer to retain this language, at the request of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE), I am offering a substitute amendment which removes this clause. He has received assurance from the Forest Service that such access is approved quickly when needed.

With this assurance, I ask support for the Virginia Wilderness Act under suspension of the rules.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 4646 adds approximately 10,570 acres to the National Wilderness Preservation System in George Washington National Forest in the State of Virginia. The two additions, the Priest and Three Ridges areas, were recommended for wilderness study in the forest management plan in 1993.

The areas, within easy access of the Appalachian Trail, contain rugged terrain and spectacular mountain scenery. We are pleased to see this addition to the wilderness system.

We are also pleased to see the removal of a provision allowing tree cutting and motorized use by county firefighters and rescue squads in and around wilderness areas. The Wilderness Act allows motorized use in wilderness areas only in the event of emergencies and to control fire, insects

and disease. Forest Service policies allow forest supervisors to approve motorized equipment and vegetation cutting in emergencies.

The removal of the provision makes H.R. 4646 consistent with the Wilderness Act. It also makes the bill identical in substance to Senator ROBB's companion measure, S. 2865, which passed the Senate on October 6, 2000. If the House had chosen to take up Senator ROBB's bill, it would have been on its way to the President. By choosing to take up the House version, the House is unnecessarily protracting the process and risking not getting a bill.

While I regret this choice, the bill enjoys administration and widespread public support, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4646, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate certain National Forest System lands within the boundaries of the State of Virginia as wilderness areas.".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIVE NATIONS CITIZENS LAND REFORM ACT OF 2000

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5308) to amend laws relating to the lands of the citizens of the Muscogee (Creek), Seminole, Cherokee, Chickasaw and Choctaw Nations, historically referred to as the Five Civilized Tribes, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5308

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Five Nations Citizens Land Reform Act of 2000".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings.
Sec. 3. Purpose.
Sec. 4. Definitions.

TITLE I—RESTRICTIONS; REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS

Sec. 101. Restrictions on real property.
Sec. 102. Restricted funds.
Sec. 103. Period of restrictions.